

---

# **NSIR One Year Later**

## ***An Organizational Effectiveness Assessment***

May 21, 2003

Prepared For the NRC Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response  
By CACI/Acton Burnell, Inc.

---

---

## CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ABOUT THE ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Need for an Assessment .....	3
Assessment Objectives .....	4
How the Assessment Was Conducted.....	4
<b>WHAT WE HEARD.....</b>	<b>8</b>
NSIR Strengths .....	8
Commission Requirements .....	9
What Needs Improvement.....	9
<b>WHAT WE RECOMMEND.....</b>	<b>14</b>
Implement Quick Hits.....	14
Clarify Leadership Roles and Responsibilities .....	15
Implement/Resume Public Relations/Outreach.....	15
Improve or Establish Standard Internal Processes and Procedures.....	16
Improve the Overall Effectiveness of Internal and External Communications .....	17
Define or redefine Internal Performance Goals, Measures, and a Measurement System ..	17
<b>WHAT TO DO NEXT .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix A. Participants .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix B. Schedule .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix C. Assessment Survey.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix D. NSIR Interview Questions.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix E. NSIR Stakeholder Interview Questions.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix F. Survey Respondent Breakdown .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Appendix G. Interview Detail Data.....</b>	<b>35</b>

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following the events of September 11, 2001, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) established a new Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response (NSIR) to better address nuclear security and incident response needs. To ensure that the new organization functioned effectively, the Commission mandated that an organizational effectiveness assessment be completed one year after NSIR's inception. Additionally, an internal survey of NSIR staff and the Fall 2002 Management Retreat surfaced some issues needing further clarification, and NSIR subsequently retained the firm of CACI/AB to perform an organizational assessment.

The assessment was conducted between October 2002 and April 2003. It consisted of an initial office-wide survey of NSIR personnel, followed by interviews of NSIR personnel and selected NSIR stakeholders (9 NRC Headquarters offices, 4 NRC Regions, 6 Federal agencies, 2 Agreement States, 2 industries, and 1 public interest group). Most stakeholder groups, particularly the Federal agencies, described their relationship with NSIR as a "partnership", rather than a "stakeholder" relationship.

Key assessment results indicated that:

- In general, responses from the Federal partners, the NRC Regions, NSIR itself and headquarter partners (e.g., NMSS, NRR, and RES) tended to be more positive about NSIR effectiveness than did responses from Agreement States, industry, and the public interest group.
- NSIR was rated highly in terms of mission clarity, vision, leadership, employees, and the reward system. The respondents believed the consolidation of security functions into NSIR was the right decision.
- When stakeholders were asked to give their top expectations of NSIR, a consistent theme of communication emerged. A majority of Federal partners said they expected prompt communication and notification from NSIR and indicated strongly that this expectation was being met. Regional representatives noted that communication and prompt notification of threat information was high on their list of expectations, and similarly expressed that NSIR was meeting those expectations. NRC internal partners also expressed a desire for NSIR to proactively share relevant information and keep them informed; however, they had mixed responses as to whether NSIR was meeting the expectation.

Representatives from industry, agreement states, and the public interest group expressed the theme that NSIR is not meeting their expectations regarding communication and feedback. Despite reporting having regular communication with NSIR, industry feels that NSIR is not sufficiently involving their expertise in the development of policy, and claims that proposed policy is sometimes inappropriate, conflicts with Federal regulation, or is of no value to public safety. Agreement states echoed a similar desire for NSIR to receive their input on policy decisions earlier in the process and for more continuous feedback.

The public interest group perceived that NSIR communicated with industry, but noted that regular information sharing meetings with public interest groups ceased after

---

9/11. They claimed that the absence of communication from NSIR leaves the public to conjure up its own version of what may or may not be reality and that the public is especially concerned with what security is in place at nuclear sites.

- NRC Interviewees (NSIR, Regions, Headquarter Partners) shared a belief that NSIR's formation had improved communications within NRC.
- Participants identified the need to clarify roles and responsibilities within NSIR. Overlap in responsibilities and leadership involvement in the assigning and monitoring of day-to-day work were both mentioned.
- Work assignment was cited as needing improvement. Priorities are said to shift frequently, and staff feels unable to get work done without overtime. A preponderance of work, especially critical and emergency work, is reportedly assigned repeatedly to the same group of individuals making up less than a quarter of the staff.
- Administrative procedures were mentioned as needing improvement, and fundamental tool support was mentioned as an issue.

Some of these issues can be resolved by quick, relatively low-cost efforts (external stakeholder communications is an example). But there are some issues, such as the definition of roles and responsibilities or the need for standard processes and procedures, which call for a more comprehensive approach. We suggest building on the strengths of NSIR and our recommendations consist of the following:

- Implement "quick hit" solutions;
- Clarify roles and responsibilities;
- Improve or establish internal processes and procedures;
- Improve overall effectiveness of internal and external communications;
- Implement/resume public relations/outreach; and
- Develop a measurement system to include internal performance goals and measurements

---

## ABOUT THE ASSESSMENT

The events of September 11, 2001 highlighted the need to reexamine how NRC was organized to carry out its safeguards, security, and incident response functions. After a review of the NRC organizational structure, staffing, and training in the security and safeguards areas, the Commission determined that greater efficiency and effectiveness could be achieved by consolidating certain NRC safeguards, security, and incident response functions. As a result, the Commission approved the establishment of a new Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response (NSIR), reporting to the Deputy Executive Director for Reactor Programs and consolidating existing organization units into the new office. The new office, which came into being on April 7, 2002, included two divisions (Division of Nuclear Security and the Division of Incident Response Operations); and combined functions from the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS), the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), the Office of Administration (ADM), and Incident Response Operations (IRO).

### Need for an Assessment

The following factors drove the need for an organizational effectiveness assessment for NSIR:

- NSIR was a newly consolidated security organization, resulting from the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the US. Therefore, NSIR's mission directly supports the President's Management Agenda (PMA) item to "Support Homeland Security, War on Terrorism, and Revitalizing the Economy". Because of the serious nature of the mission, high stakes, and high visibility of this office, an organizational assessment was a best business practice for gauging NSIR's organizational health and effectiveness as a newly created/consolidated organization.
- NSIR staff voiced, via a short, informal, self-administered survey, that organizational issues exist with the NSIR structure, infrastructure, organization, communication, morale, and process and procedures that affect employees' effectiveness and efficiency in doing their jobs. An assessment was needed to better examine these issues for the purpose of: (1) providing recommendations for resolving them and for (2) helping NSIR management set performance goals and measures for organizational effectiveness in the major areas highlighted by the survey.
- To ensure effective and efficient operations within this newly formed organization, the Commission mandated that an organizational effectiveness assessment be completed within one year after NSIR's inception.
- NSIR was created as a leaner, flatter organization as a potential prototype for other changes within the NRC. Experience with the new organization would provide useful insights to the agency. The assessment may indicate the need for fine-tuning adjustments for this first-of-a-kind organization.
- NSIR is somewhat different than other offices in the NRC because it was created, among other reasons, to facilitate external communication and coordinate with other agencies regarding homeland security. The nature of the work inherently requires close and continuing interactions with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Homeland Security Council (HSC), and other organizations. The assessment

---

provides an independent account of the effectiveness of this interface.

## Assessment Objectives

The objectives of this organizational assessment were:


- To provide the Commission a clear and comprehensive description of NSIR's organizational effectiveness based on data gathered from October 2002 - March 2003; and include recommendations for improvement, and possible performance goals and measures for NSIR leadership and management in seven areas of organizational effectiveness.
- To help NSIR leadership and managers identify and track performance goals and measures in these seven areas of organizational effectiveness:
  - o **Purpose** (what business are we in?) – Clarity of the NSIR mission, authority and areas of responsibility.
  - o **Structure** (how do we divide the work?) – NSIR organizational structure, levels of management and reporting structure, span of control. Adequacy of staff resources, including identification of critical skills and staff training requirements.
  - o **Rewards** (do all needed tasks have incentives?) – consistency and alignment between desired behaviors and the reward system for them. For example, does the organization voice “teamwork” but reward individual performance?
  - o **Helpful Mechanisms** (have we coordinating technologies or the right tools?) – Effectiveness of tools, techniques, meetings, and processes/procedures to manage workflow within the office and NSIR interactions and coordination with other organizations.
  - o **Relationships** (how do we manage conflict among people?) – Effectiveness of interpersonal relationships between individuals; relationships between units or departments, and with stakeholders.
  - o **Leadership** (are we keeping these other six areas in balance?) The primary role of leadership in keeping the other areas in balance; maintaining clarity of purpose for the organization, and making certain the organization is operating smoothly and structured properly in support of that purpose.
  - o **Environment** (what effect does the environment have on the organization?) - Influences on NSIR, including external influences such as threat level, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Homeland Security Council, the general public, as well as NSIR's influence on the environment such as perception of public safety through products, security measures, orders, correspondence, and outreach.

## How the Assessment Was Conducted

The methodological framework selected for the assessment was based on a model developed by management consultant Marvin Weisbord and originally published in 1978. The Weisbord model (see Figure 1, p. 5) is widely used in a variety of organizational

settings to assess organizational effectiveness. The benefits of using the Weisbord model include:

- The model takes a comprehensive approach in that most all organizational issues, no matter what they are, can be classified in at least one of the seven areas of the model;
- It takes a “systems” approach by showing interrelationships, and further demonstrates and delineates “cause and effect” organizational issues and relationships;
- The model can serve as a basis for strategic planning of organizational change because it not only presents all important elements to be considered in an organization, but also provides a representation of how changes in one organizational area might affect other areas;
- It was an appropriate model to use for the NSIR assessment, as it encompassed the seven areas originally identified by NSIR management (see Table 1 below).



**Figure 1 - Weisbord Model**

Table 1 below shows the correlation between the areas identified for examination by NSIR and the seven areas of the Weisbord Model.

<b>Areas Identified by NSIR for Assessment</b>		<b>Weisbord Model</b>
1.	Clarity of office's mission, authority and areas of responsibility	Purpose
2.	Office's organizational structure, levels of management and reporting structure, span of control	Structure; Leadership
3.	Adequacy of staff resources, including identification of critical skills and staff training requirements	Structure; Leadership
4.	Adequacy of funding for baseline and Homeland Security functions, responsibilities	Environment

5. Effectiveness of communications within NSIR, between NSIR and other NRC organizations, and with external stakeholders	Helpful Mechanisms; Relationships
6. Effectiveness of procedures to manage workflow within the office and NSIR interactions and coordination with other NRC offices	Helpful Mechanisms; Relationships
7. Any other areas that would provide an objective measure of the office's overall effectiveness in accomplishing its mission	Rewards; All

**Table 1 - NSIR Assessment Areas Matched to Weisbord Model**

Because the Weisbord model is not designed to measure [customer] service, a service-oriented interview was developed for NSIR's stakeholders. The custom-developed interview gauged stakeholder satisfaction and stakeholder expectations of the newly formed NSIR organization.

The steps involved in conducting the Assessment were:

1. Review background information about NSIR, the August 2002 NSIR internal survey results, and the Commission's stated goals (SRM) for creating NSIR;
2. Custom design and administer a comprehensive survey of NSIR personnel (the Assessment Survey) to address the seven areas;
3. Conduct interviews of both internal and external stakeholders (interviewee names provided by NSIR management);
4. Conduct interviews of NSIR employees (including leadership);
5. Compile and analyze data collected from the Assessment Survey, stakeholder interviews, and NSIR interviews;
6. Deliver briefing to NSIR leadership and staff;
7. Prepare and deliver a draft report containing recommendations

The assessment strategy moved from a broad view of NSIR (the Assessment Survey) to a more specific focus (the interviews). The interviews were custom tailored to issues specific to divisions. The benefits of this strategy were to minimize the amount of time NSIR employees needed to be involved in the assessment and provide further details through one-on-one confidential interviews.

NSIR management previewed the approach, was periodically updated on the status of the effort, and assisted the contractor in the development of interview questions. For stakeholder interviews, NSIR selected the names of individuals from the following: Federal partners, Regional Offices, Headquarters partners, Agreement States, industry, and public interest groups. Staff members to be interviewed were selected by a random process. Interviews were routinely conducted by two contractor staff members to maximize the quantity and accuracy of the information collected. To assure that NSIR



---

internal interviewees felt free to be open and honest in their responses, NSIR management agreed that the responses would not be attributable to individuals, only reported as summary and statistics.

### **Initial Office-Wide Assessment Survey**

A written survey consisting of 60 diagnostic questions was developed and distributed to all NSIR employees. The design of the survey was based on the Weisbord Model's seven areas of organizational effectiveness (see "Assessment Objectives" above). The resulting survey sample (60% of NSIR personnel returned a completed survey) was then analyzed to provide a quantitative baseline understanding of the perception of NSIR members on different organizational areas, and to identify areas within the organization where staff and management concerns appeared to exist. The areas where issues appeared to exist were then targeted for further exploration during individual interviews.

### **Follow-up Interviews**

The interviews were structured into two categories – stakeholders and NSIR employees. The stakeholder interviews were specifically designed to understand the perception that external stakeholders have of NSIR, from a service-oriented perspective (as stated previously). NSIR employees were selected for interviews according to the following criteria:

- A random sample was selected (the qualified pool of candidate interviewees were assigned numbers and the numbers "drawn from a hat");
- Volunteers were to be included;
- Leadership to include: the Office Director, the two Division Directors, and the Program Management, Policy Development and Analysis Staff (PMDA) Chief, were to be interviewed (this was to compare the leadership responses with everyone else);
- At least one representative from each section was to be included;
- Because of time and resource constraints and to ensure employees had sufficient experience within NSIR, the "qualified" random sample interviewee pool was limited to those individuals with over two months experience in NSIR.
- Rotational employees were not included in the interview pool.

Twenty-four percent of qualified NSIR personnel participated in the interviews, including two from the Office of the Director, two from PMDA, seven from IRO, and 15 from DNS. Representatives from 24 stakeholder organizations were interviewed, including nine from NRC internal partners, four from the NRC Regions, six Federal partners, two each from Agreement States and industry organizations, and one from a public interest group (refer to Appendix A for a complete list of participating stakeholder organizations).

---

## WHAT WE HEARD

### NSIR Strengths

NSIR perceives that it is effective overall, a sentiment supported by the Federal partners and the Regions (the second greatest response was “too soon to tell”). Specific areas rated as effective were:

- **Clarity of mission** – There is understanding of how work relates to mission, and the importance of the mission;
- **Vision** – is being met or on its way; this was supported by Federal partners, Headquarter partners, and Regions;
- **Consolidation process to create NSIR** – is considered “the right/appropriate” decision to deal with post 9/11 world; this opinion was echoed by Federal partners, Headquarter partners, Regions, and NSIR;
- **NSIR leadership** - (Director/Deputy Director/Division Directors) is well-respected, having good working relationships with each other and with Federal partners; represent the NRC well. There is a sense that NSIR leaders are genuine and care about their employees;
- **Employees/people** - NSIR's greatest asset; considered talented, dedicated, hard working, smart, competent, and capable. The progress of NSIR was generally attributed to the people rather than to the organization;
- **Reward system** – The data showed that NSIR undoubtedly has a reward system in place. People are clearly aware of and are recipients of tangible rewards (monetary awards, certificates/plaques); and/or intangible rewards (praise from the leadership or management, such as saying “thank you”, “good job”; and the opportunity to do interesting work). The data showed that both individual and team awards were apparent and that the team awards were perceived as equitable. Furthermore, NSIR employees feel that their work is personally rewarding to them, and that, when they come to work, they are generally fully occupied with the work they have to do. In addition, NSIR employees generally feel that the NSIR work environment allows open discussion of issues and that the leadership fosters an “open door” policy.

Note: although the reward system was rated as a strength, NSIR should be aware of the following observation that applies to tangible awards only. The data showed that the criteria for receiving tangible awards, specifically monetary/cash awards, appear ambiguous or unknown to many NSIR staff. Some staff receiving cash awards or certificates claimed that they did not know specifically why – they did not know of specific criteria or benchmarks. Similarly, those who had **not** received awards also claimed they did not know the criteria. This lack of awareness has led some staff to claim that only “favorites” or “people on high profile projects” got awards. NSIR should consider the following implications:

- There is risk of decreased engagement by those not getting tangible awards and not knowing why, (perceiving “why bother” because it only goes to “favorites” or “high profile projects”);
- There is risk of an award losing its significance by those who feel everyone gets

- tangible awards regardless of contribution; and
- **IF** tangible rewards are only going primarily to people putting in significant overtime, NSIR may risk creating a culture/environment where considerable overtime is valued/modeled, regardless of actual contribution. Such an environment could lead to further fatigue or burnout.

## Commission Requirements

The Commission established three requirements for NSIR to fulfill. The requirements and the assessment results were as follows:

### Requirement – Improve Security Performance by Consolidation

*NSIR was created to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness by consolidating certain NRC safeguards, security, and incident response functions. Has the creation of NSIR improved security performance (compared to pre-9/11 or pre NSIR)?*

NSIR	REGIONS	Federal Partners	HQ Partners	Agreement States	Industry	Public Interest Group
Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>3</sup>	No <sup>2</sup>	No <sup>2</sup>	No <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> more than half felt unqualified to answer

<sup>2</sup> samples were statistically very small. But to whatever degree they accurately reflect the perception of others in their category, there may be an expectation gap between these groups and NSIR.

<sup>3</sup> more than half felt unqualified to answer; one interviewee said both yes and no

### Requirement - Improve Communications within NRC

*The creation of NSIR has improved security and incident response communications within NRC; improved effectiveness of communication with my office.*

NSIR	REGIONS	HQ Partners
Yes	Yes	Yes

### Requirement - Improve Communications with External Stakeholders

*The creation of NSIR has improved effectiveness of communications with external stakeholders.*

NSIR	Federal Partners	Agreement States	Industry	Public Interest Group
Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Mixed <sup>2</sup>	Mixed <sup>2</sup>	No

<sup>1</sup> more than half felt unqualified to answer

<sup>2</sup> of two respondents, one agreed and the other disagreed

## What Needs Improvement

The key areas for improvement surfaced by the assessment are shown within the

framework of the Weisbord model, which shows the interrelationships among the NSIR organizational issues (see Figure 2, below). The model provides an overview that shows cause-effect relationships among key issues, and also points to potential solutions. For example, NSIR's relationship to its external environment is a key influence because external influences appear to cause priorities to change constantly. Because leadership's role is to "keep the boxes in balance," leadership may address this issue both within the organization (e.g., how work is prioritized and distributed) as well as externally (how it might respond to the external environment to influence the workload).

Following Figure 2 is a description of the key issues affecting NSIR with each issue linked to one of the seven areas of the model.




Figure 2 – Weisbord Model with NSIR Organizational Issues

---

## **Roles and Responsibilities Appear to Need Clarification (*Purpose*)**

Division of roles and responsibilities was reported to need clarity in some areas of leadership, between DNS administrative staff and the technical staff they support, and between specific sections within DNS.

- Leadership was perceived as too often directly involved in operational work, leading to some individuals feeling over-managed. To the extent this happens, it could impact the organization by diverting leadership from their important role of influencing and setting the course of the organization.
- There is a perception in DNS that overlap or uncertainty regarding roles and responsibilities may exist within the following DNS sections. (It should be noted that during the time the assessment was conducted, DNS reorganized to add three new sections and continued to increase in staff size):
  - o Between Security Oversight Section and Security Performance Evaluations Section
  - o Between Security Oversight Section and Materials Transportation and Waste Security Section
  - o Within Reactor Security Section
  - o Between Policy vs. Operations
  - o Within Fuel Cycle and Special Security Programs
  - o Between DNS and NMSS on joint efforts
- There is need for alignment of the roles between the DNS secretarial staff and technical personnel that they support. As a result, NSIR (both IRO and DNS) technical staff time is wasted in tracking down travel orders, correspondence, etc. that is submitted through the DNS secretarial staff.

## **Work Seen as Not Equitably Distributed (*Structure*)**

Work priorities are seen as constantly changing in response to myriad external influences such as increased threat level, the NRC Commission, or diverse external stakeholders. Much of this work seems to be unanticipated, and NSIR is perceived to be in a reactive mode. Some participants claimed that “everything” was high priority. At least some work, especially the high-priority emergency work, was said to be repeatedly assigned to a small pool of staff known colloquially as the “go-tos”. According to interviewees, this takes place even though others say they are also qualified to perform work and may feel underutilized. Although “go-to” work distribution was claimed to occur throughout NSIR, the data showed that it is predominately a DNS issue. There was speculation by some interviewees, including both staff and leadership, that those not being utilized fully are “unknown quantities”. Management/leadership, often reacting to priorities determined by external influences, repeatedly assign high priority work to those with whom they feel comfortable and confident, rather than distributing the work more equitably. As a result, the “go-tos” often do not get relief, and become fatigued, while others who claim they are capable are not being fully utilized.

## **Overtime Essential to Getting Work Completed (*Rewards*)**

Staff is often said to be unable to get work done without overtime. This affects the DNS

---

“go-tos” (mentioned above) others as well due to the post-9/11 volume of work, and many others when the threat level is raised.

### **Some Procedures Missing or Ineffective (*Helpful Mechanisms*)**

Both office workflow and administrative procedures were mentioned as needing improvement. Specifically, NSIR employees cited lack of an effective tracking system to manage workflow and administrative secretarial procedures for work submitted through the DNS secretarial staff. In addition, there were many varied general procedures cited as being non-existent; in fact, some suggested using best practices from their previous organization. This may be the result of the newness of the organization; however, the results are lowered productivity, and frustration for many.

### **Fundamental Technology Support Lacking (*Helpful Mechanisms*)**

Fundamental technology support is apparently not being provided to DNS technical employees in a timely manner or not at all. Specifically, some DNS technical personnel stated they were in need of removable hard drives and secure laptops/safeguards computers. This is claimed to be a source of significant inefficiency by DNS personnel, resulting in wasted time and lowered productivity.

### **Physical Office Space/Layout Not Productive (*Helpful Mechanisms*)**

The physical office space and layout provided to many DNS employees is not considered to be a productive work environment. Several DNS technical employees claimed that their workspace is located in a high traffic area where noise and disruption are common. Another theme was the inadequate size of workspace, and inefficiencies introduced by relocating filing cabinets that were once close at hand to less accessible areas. In some cases, employees claimed they had to get rid of documents because they had no room to store them. In addition, there is a lack of adequate space to hold team meetings.

### **Industry, Agreement States, and Public Interest Claim Expectations Not Being Met (*Relationships*)**

When stakeholders were asked to give their top expectations of NSIR, a consistent theme of communication emerged. A majority of Federal partners said they expected prompt communication and notification from NSIR and indicated strongly that this expectation is being met. Regional representatives also noted that communication and prompt notification of threat information was high on their list of expectations, and similarly expressed that NSIR is meeting those expectations. NRC internal partners expressed a desire for NSIR to proactively share relevant information and keep them informed; however, they had mixed responses as to whether NSIR was meeting the expectation.

Representatives from industry, Agreement States, and the public interest group expressed the theme that NSIR is neglecting to meet their expectations regarding communication and feedback. Despite reporting having regular communication with NSIR, industry feels that NSIR is not sufficiently involving their expertise in the development of policy, and claims that proposed policy is sometimes inappropriate, conflicts with Federal regulation, or is of no value to public safety. Agreement States echoed a similar desire for NSIR to receive their input on policy decisions earlier in the

---

process and for more continuous feedback.

The public interest group perceived that NSIR communicated with industry, but noted that regular information sharing meetings with public interest groups ceased after 9/11. They claimed that the absence of communication from NSIR leaves the public to conjure up its own version of what may or may not be reality and that the public is especially concerned with what security is in place at nuclear sites.

**NSIR Leadership is Reactive Rather than Proactive in Responding to Change  
(Environment/Leadership)**

NSIR priorities appear to come from its external environment. There is a perception that NSIR is unable to anticipate change and therefore reacts to its environment. The greatest environmental influences on NSIR appear to be:

- White House/Homeland Security Council/Department of Homeland Security
- Threat level
- NRC Commission
- Congress
- General Public

**Priorities Constantly Changing (Leadership)**

Priorities were described as being set by leadership, but then to constantly change. Participants said that “everything” was “priority 1”, which some employees claim leads to a “reactive” or “panic” work environment in staff responsible for priority 1 work, which may lead to fatigue and burnout.

---

## WHAT WE RECOMMEND

The following recommendations reflect results of our assessment findings, a review of ongoing NSIR and NRC initiatives, and organization effectiveness best practices. Some are quick, relatively low cost efforts, which require a shift in focus rather than doing additional work. But there are some issues, such as the need for definition of roles and responsibilities and lack of standard processes and procedures, which call for a more comprehensive approach. The approach builds on the current strengths of NSIR and consists of the following components:

- Implement quick hits to demonstrate management's commitment to addressing concerns raised during the assessment;
- Clarify leadership roles and responsibilities and adjust distribution of work;
- Implement or resume public relations/outreach to selected external stakeholders, including public interest groups, Agreement States, and the general public;
- Improve or establish standard internal administrative processes and procedures;
- Increase effectiveness of internal and external communications; and
- Review internal performance goals and develop a measurement system to include internal performance goals and measurements.

### Implement Quick Hits

The following high value/low risk ideas should be considered immediately to address some of the concerns documented during the assessment. Some may already be implemented or underway; all should offer significant potential. This list should be considered as a starting point, with additions to be added by NSIR:

- Assign DNS administrative staff to support DNS technical staff;
- Empower a team of selected section chiefs to determine if there are still functional alignment issues within DNS, and, if so, to correct these issues;
- Address issues surrounding equitable distribution of work in DNS. Start to assign work by function, not individuals; rather than assigning tasks to individual staff (e.g., the "go-tos"), consider using team/team coordinators whereby known staff are teamed or paired with other staff (e.g. new or unknown) on high priority projects to ensure the quality of the work while investing in staff development to accommodate future efforts;
- Adopt/modify pre-existing procedures from other NRC partner organizations (e.g., NMSS, ADM, NRR, etc.). Interview data indicates that staff has this knowledge. Empower/allow/encourage individual efforts by the staff to develop and adapt procedures;
- Provide DNS technical staff with (1) removable hard drives and (2) secure laptops/safeguards computers. Long term – create a customer service oriented process that includes a measure/deadline for fulfilling customer IT orders;
- Create standard templates for external communications, e.g., apply checklist for dealing with Regions or a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) for information sharing with other offices and external stakeholders, and make these templates centrally available;
- Seek to utilize/proactively engage the ideas of people with pre-NSIR business knowledge and expertise to include: underutilized NSIR employees, Headquarters partners (NMSS, NRR, RES); Industry/Agreement States representatives; and



- 
- Continue to work with NRC's office of Administration to improve the work environment of DNS technical employees. While technically some environmental issues are beyond the scope of a quick hit solution, NSIR should explore ways to improve the office layout and ambient noise to help ensure a more productive work environment while awaiting long-term improvements.

Additional suggestions for improvement go beyond the suggested quick hits and require a more comprehensive approach. Each suggestion is linked to the appropriate area(s) of the Weisbord model.

### **Clarify Leadership Roles and Responsibilities (Leadership/Purpose)**

The assessment highlighted an issue of the appropriate leadership roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis staff engaged in operational work. Some degree of this is typical in all new organizations; but because of NSIR's adoption of a de-layered management structure it is not clear that the answer is as easy as simply allowing time to build trust and work out alignment issues. De-layering implies a significant shift of accountability and responsibilities through empowerment of operations staff and managers. Specifically, we suggest that NSIR:

- Engage leadership to focus on proactively influencing/managing priorities coming from the environment (e.g., Department of Homeland Security, NRC Commission, general public, Congress) before the work reaches NSIR, and explore ways to influence tomorrow's priorities vs. reacting to them today;
- Conduct a scenario planning exercise to anticipate and generate alternative options of response to possible scenarios of the influx of work from the environment;
- Operate from a "security" environment vs. the current "regulatory" environment; and
- Delegate all non-leadership related tasks to management level (Section Chiefs), encourage the management level to have more authority/delegation, and encourage staff to have more autonomy and ownership of products.

### **Implement/Resume Public Relations/Outreach (Relationships)**

A cross-section of stakeholders (ranging from DHS to Union of Concerned Scientists) and NSIR personnel alike recognize the need for NSIR/NRC to take a leading role in relations with external stakeholders. Specifically, during the interviews, both stakeholders and NSIR personnel provided similar insights (which are listed in the form of recommendations) for dealing with post 9/11 communication to the public. These recommendations are paraphrased from interviews:

- *Defensive measures NSIR has implemented should be publicized, but don't give away the details. NRC needs to reach out more to the public and let them know we have implemented measures. We need a sustained public campaign. . . NSIR/NRC is the Administration's face to the public on nuclear power issues; they have an important role on public awareness and outreach.*
  - Federal Partner
- *We are denied meetings and no information is available. People living around*

---

*nuclear power plants feel anxious. If NRC was doing its job, I think there would be less anxiety around plants. NRC/NSIR should use the Salt Lake City Olympic games as a model: publicize that security is high, but don't give away the details/sensitive information"*

- Public interest organization
- [Regarding relationship with public/public interest groups] *The solution is additional dialogue. We need to say we are doing something but not give away the details.*
  - DNS personnel
- *IRO directly interfaces with the public and eases the public concern. We get a lot of citizen concern. Public awareness is important to keep down the panic mode.*
  - IRO personnel

In addition to utilizing public relations/outreach to address public concerns without giving away specific security details, Agreement State stakeholders voiced another external relations-oriented recommendation: that NSIR needs to demonstrate value by having a "PR" person to explain NSIR's role and value to the Agreement States. Agreement States and Industry generally agree that an improved NSIR organization in a year from now would embody *a national program with focus and direction, with a defined role, who shares info in a manner that states/Industry can use. Requirements would be specific, not vague.*

### **Improve or Establish Standard Internal Processes and Procedures (Helpful Mechanisms)**

While some NSIR procedural issues are relatively simple to fix (such as processing travel authorization), NSIR should resist overusing a "band-aid" approach to improving procedures. Some concerns identified during the assessment are somewhat complex and mission-critical, such as distribution of work assignments and prioritization. Procedures are reflective of the processes they support, and attempts to fix them may mask ineffective policies and processes behind them.

We suggest the establishment of an administrative cross-functional team whose charter would be to establish and standardize effective procedures that would support well-defined workflow practices. Sponsored by PMDA, the team should be an on-going body with a rotating membership consisting of representatives from the administrative, managerial, and technical areas. While the team would require an investment in time, we believe that the investment would result in increased administrative efficiencies that could greatly benefit NSIR. The team would meet regularly (e.g., twice a month for two hours) and would coordinate administrative issues by reviewing, prioritizing, and addressing administrative issues within NSIR.

In the interim to quickly address the lack of administrative procedures, as referenced in the Quick Hits, NSIR may choose to adopt/modify pre-existing procedures from other NRC partner organizations. This would take advantage of best practices used within the NRC and expedite the development process. There would still be the need, however, for an administrative team to review the best practice, add modifications where necessary for NSIR, and be empowered to implement the procedure.

---

### **Improve the Overall Effectiveness of Internal and External Communications (Relationships/Helpful Mechanisms)**

This effort would focus on the issues surfaced in the assessment to improve communications related areas such as policy development and information sharing among certain stakeholder groups. A best practice successfully implemented by government agencies is the establishment of an inter-agency working group. Coordinated by NSIR, this group would focus on sharing consistent information both within and outside the NRC, with members to include Federal partners, Agreement States, industry, and public interest groups. In addition, the working group would capitalize on NSIR's experience as a start-up organization to explore ways of collaboration among NSIR stakeholders and take turns sharing best practices among members.

### **Define or redefine Internal Performance Goals, Measures, and a Measurement System (Helpful Mechanisms)**

A key to improving NSIR efficiency is to create a revised set of tools for defining and communicating expectations across the organization. These tools should eliminate the need for much of the detail-level direct involvement of leadership in operations - freeing leadership to focus on strategy. By establishing a set of performance goals for the entire NSIR organization, accompanied by measurement and performance-based management practices, NSIR will become more efficient and effective, staff will be clear on what is expected of them, and reward criteria communication (mentioned as an issue in the organizational assessment) will be simplified by being based on performance relative to performance goals and targets. The Weisbord model may be used as a framework to create performance goals, with specific goals defined within each of the seven areas.

---

## WHAT TO DO NEXT

The suggested next steps for NSIR Leadership are:

- Review findings and present recommendations to the staff;
- Convene a management team to determine an action plan for implementing recommendations;
- Create teams and launch initiatives to implement quick hits;
- Plan and schedule the other improvement initiatives (Redefinition of roles and responsibilities, improvement of internal processes and procedures, and establishment of office-wide internal performance goals and performance-based management practices);
- Commit resources to support implementing the recommendations.

---

## **Appendix A. Participants**

### **NSIR Assessment Project Management**

Roy Zimmerman and Mike Weber - Executive Sponsors  
Jack Davis - PMDA Sponsor  
Susan Castro - NSIR Assessment Project Manager

### **NSIR Survey Respondents**

NSIR staff and managers - 72 out of 120 receiving questionnaire responded

### **NSIR Interviewees (26)**

Office of Director (2)  
PMDA (2)  
IRO (7)  
DNS (15)

### **NSIR Stakeholder and Partner Organization Interviewees (24)**

9 NRC Internal Partners (NMSS, NRR, Office of Research, Office of International Programs, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Public Affairs, Office of Administration, Office of State and Tribal Programs, EDO)

4 NRC Regional Administrators

6 Federal Partners (CIA, DOE, FBI, FEMA, NORAD, OHS (now DHS))  
2 Industry Organizations (TXU Energy, Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI))  
2 Agreement States (Illinois, South Carolina)  
1 Public Interest Group (Union of Concerned Scientists)

### **Contractor Personnel – CACI AB, Inc. (formerly Acton Burnell, Inc.)**

Lisa Arterberry - Contractor Program Manager  
Cindy Demnitz  
Lori Nicely  
Neil Zenah

---

## Appendix B. Schedule

TASK	DATE
Step 1: Review background information	Oct. 2002
Step 2: Verify scope of assessment	Nov. 2002
Step 3: Confirm executive leadership alignment	Nov. 2002
Step 4: Kick-off assessment	Nov. 2002
Step 5: Administer NSIR internal organizational survey	Nov. 2002
Step 6: Analyze survey results; present to NSIR management. Finalize stakeholder interview questions	Dec. 2002
Step 7: Conduct NSIR internal and external stakeholder interviews (e.g., NRC offices, NEI, FBI)	Jan. 2003
Step 8: Analyze stakeholder interview results	Feb. 2003
Step 9: Conduct internal NSIR interviews	Mar. 2003
Step 10: Analyze and consolidate assessment data	Apr. 2003
Step 11: Present data/recommendations at facilitated session	Apr. 2003
Step 12: Finalize data, recommendations and deliver draft report	Apr. 2003
Step 13: Identify performance goals and outcomes for scope areas	May 2003
Step 14: Finalize and deliver full report	June 2003

---

## Appendix C. Assessment Survey

### Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response (NSIR)

**Instructions:** Please circle your response to each question as it relates to your experiences as an NSIR employee.

**My division/section within NSIR is: (circle one)**

Office of the Director	PMDA	IRO	DNS
	SG Communications	Coordination	Threat Assessment
	Admin Support	Operations	Materials Safeguards
	Financial		Reactor Safeguards Policy
			Reactor Safeguard Oversight
			Information Security

**My job function within NSIR is best described as: (circle one)**

Division Deputy Director and above	Section Chief	Technical Staff
Administrative/Support		

**1. NSIR has a clear mission.**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
(SD)	(D)	(U)	(A)	(SA)

**2. I understand how my work directly relates to the mission of NSIR.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**3. NSIR has a clear vision of where it is going for the future.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**4. Different parts of NSIR work together well.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**5. In NSIR, individual roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**6. NSIR has a clear set of organizational values.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**7. NSIR has an Operations Plan.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**8. The work that NSIR does is vital to public safety and national security.**

---

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**9. Quality of work in NSIR is not affected by staff burnout/fatigue.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**10. NSIR adapts well to change.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**11. Workload is distributed equitably among available qualified NSIR staff members.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**12. NSIR provides the skills/training I need to do my job.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**13. Boundaries between sections or divisions rarely interfere with solving joint problems in NSIR.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**14. In NSIR, when an issue arises requiring management involvement, there is a clear delegation of responsibility: I know which manager to go to.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**15. NSIR's physical office space/layout provides a productive environment for me to do my work.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**16. NSIR management team has the right level of knowledge and experience in security-related matters.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**17. NSIR's organizational structure enables me to effectively carry out my job responsibilities.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**18. NSIR's current management structure (flatter organization) is effective.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**19. Security performance has been improved by consolidating certain NRC safeguards, security, and incident response functions into the NSIR organization.**



---

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**20. The NRC culture enables NSIR to operate effectively.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**21. I am most often able to get my work done without working overtime .**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**22. As an individual, I feel I am appropriately rewarded for my work.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**23. NSIR rewards teamwork.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**24. The work I'm doing in NSIR is personally rewarding to me.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**25. I am rewarded for learning.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**26. Management holds people accountable for substandard work or non-performance.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**27. NSIR provides opportunities for me to progress in my career.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**28. I am fully occupied with the work I have to do.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**29. NSIR does a good job recruiting qualified hires.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**30. NSIR provides an open environment for discussing issues.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**31. My manager effectively plans and distributes workload to align with office/agency goals.**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>32. I am satisfied with the performance appraisal process within NSIR.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>33. NSIR/NRC provides the necessary information technology (systems/applications) for me to effectively and efficiently do my job.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>34. The meetings I attend in NSIR are well run and achieve their purpose.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>35. NSIR coordinates efforts with other NRC organizations, where appropriate.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>36. Meetings across levels or between sections within NSIR occur when needed.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>37. NSIR has effective procedures in place for managing workflow.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>38. Management follows up on employee concerns/action items.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>39. NSIR meets its customer's/stakeholder's expectations.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>40. NSIR is responsive to stakeholder/customer requests.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>41. Within NSIR, people actively share information, as appropriate.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>42. Within NSIR, people effectively collaborate to solve problems.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA
<b>43. Management explains what needs to be done and trusts me to figure out how to do it.</b>					
	1	2	3	4	5
	SD	D	U	A	SA

---

**44. In NSIR, people actively help one another.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**45. Management deals with conflicts appropriately and in a timely manner.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**46. Management keeps me informed of relevant activities that may affect my work.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**47. The creation of NSIR has improved security and incident response communications within NRC.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**48. The creation of NSIR has improved effectiveness of communications with external stakeholders.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**49. NSIR anticipates change and prepares for it.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**50. I have the necessary resources to do my job.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**51. NSIR receives adequate funding to support its mission.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**52. In NSIR I can take risks in making decisions without fear of negative consequences.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**53. NSIR's leadership establishes a strategic direction and vision for the organization.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**54. I have periodic performance goals (e.g., quarterly or annually).**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	S

**55. I am held accountable for achieving periodic performance goals (e.g., quarterly**

---

or annually).

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	S

**56. NSIR's leadership maintains clarity of purpose for NSIR.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**57. NSIR's leadership is effective in setting priorities for NSIR.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**58. NSIR's leadership looks at the big picture and encourages NSIR to seek solutions to problems in that context.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**59. NSIR's leadership contributes to NSIR operating effectively.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**60. NSIR's leadership is focusing on the right issues to further the effectiveness of NSIR.**

1	2	3	4	5
SD	D	U	A	SA

**General Comments:**

---

---

---

---

---

For more information about the Organizational Effectiveness Assessment, please contact contractors Lori Nicely 415-2301 [LDN@nrc.gov](mailto:LDN@nrc.gov) or Cindy Demnitz 415-2318 [CJD@nrc.gov](mailto:CJD@nrc.gov).

---

## Appendix D. NSIR Interview Questions

How long have you worked for NRC?

How long have you worked for NSIR?

Which of these four categories best describes your job category? Leadership/Executive, Supervisor, Technical, Administrative

### PURPOSE

What is your understanding of NSIR's mission?

How effective is NSIR in meeting its mission? How do you know? What data source tells you?

(N/A for IRO, but ask anyway) In the survey, the majority of participants indicated that, in NSIR, individual roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined. Is that your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": If so, could you provide specific examples of individual areas of responsibility that are not clearly defined?

Could you provide specific examples of organizational areas of responsibility that are not clearly defined?

Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?

- FOR "NO": If not, could you provide specific examples of individual areas that ARE clearly defined. Also, provide examples of organizational areas that ARE clearly defined.

### STRUCTURE

How would you describe the way in which NRC is organized?

How does this structure support the goals/mission of the organization?

How does NSIR fit into this structure?

How does the way in which NSIR is organized support the goals/mission of NSIR?

How well does your unit function (DNS, IRO, PMDA, Office of Director) within NSIR?

How do you know? What data source tells you?

NSIR was created to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness by consolidating certain NRC safeguards, security, and incident response functions. Has the creation of NSIR improved security performance (compared to pre-9/11 or pre-NSIR)? (Y/N/can't answer). How do you know? What data source tells you?

Overall, is NSIR organized correctly to meet its mission? (Y/N)

---

Is your division organized correctly to meet NSIR's mission? (Y/N).

- FOR "NO": What specifically needs to be changed in order for NSIR to be organized correctly to meet its mission?

(N/A for IRO, but ask anyway) In the survey, some NSIR participants indicated that quality of work in NSIR is affected by staff burnout/fatigue. Is that your experience? (Y/N).

- FOR "YES": If so, why do you think quality of work is affected by staff burnout/fatigue? What organizational factor do you believe is causing this? Could you provide a specific example of how burnout/fatigue has affected the quality of a specific work product?

Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?

- FOR "NO": If you don't feel quality of work is affected by burnout/fatigue, tell us what day-to-day factors are working to ensure that quality of work is not affected by burnout/fatigue.

In the survey, the majority of participants indicated that the workload in NSIR is not distributed equitably among available qualified NSIR staff members. Is that your observation? (Y/N).

- FOR "YES": If so, could you provide specific examples of work not being distributed in an equitable manner? Why do you think this is happening? What organizational factor do you believe is causing this? Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?
- FOR "NO": If not, could you provide examples of work being distributed in an equitable manner.

FOR PMDA ONLY: In the survey, some PMDA participants indicated that boundaries between sections or divisions interfere with solving joint problems in NSIR. Is that your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": Give a specific example of a boundary between a section or division interfering with solving a joint problem. What organizational factor do you believe is causing this?
- FOR "NO": Give an example of sections or divisions working together to solve joint problems.

FOR DNS ONLY: In the survey, some DNS participants indicated that the current management structure (flatter organization) is not effective. Is that your experience? (Y/N).

- FOR "YES": Could you elaborate? What specifically is not effective about the current management structure?
- FOR "NO": What specifically do you feel is effective about the current management structure?

FOR DNS ONLY: In the survey, some DNS participants indicated that NSIR's physical office space/layout does not provide a productive environment for doing work. Is that your experience? (Y/N).

- FOR "YES": Could you elaborate? What specific characteristics of your office space/layout contribute to a non-productive work environment? What do you need to make it a productive work environment?

- 
- FOR “NO”: What specific characteristics of your office space/layout contribute to a productive work environment?

## **LEADERSHIP**

How would you describe the leadership style here at NRC?

How would you describe the leadership style within NSIR? Does this differ from the rest of NRC, if so, how?

What do you feel is particularly effective about NSIR’s leadership?

(N/A for IRO, but ask anyway) In the survey, participants indicated that the leadership is not effective in setting priorities for NSIR. Is that your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR “YES”: If so, could you give a specific example of priorities not being set by leadership? Who are you considering “leadership”? Office of Director level (Roy and Mike)? or Division Director level (Glenn, Dick, Jack)? Or Both?
- FOR “NO”: If not, give an example of leadership effectively setting priorities.

## **RELATIONSHIPS**

Does NSIR have a successful relationship with NRC internal partners (such as NSIR, NRR, RES, etc.)? How do you know? What data source tells you?

Does NSIR/NRC have a successful relationship with Industry stakeholders and licensees?

How about with agreement states?

How about with the public and public interest groups?:

## **REWARDS**

How do people get rewarded at NSIR (tangible – money, time-off. Intangible- praise, opportunities for interesting work, etc.)?

(N/A for IRO, but ask anyway) In the survey, participants indicated that staff is not able to get work done without working overtime. Is that your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR “YES”: Does it affect you personally or are you making this observation of your coworkers?

Give a specific example of staff not able to get work done without working overtime.

Are there regularly occurring business needs that require staff overtime? Is the need justified? (Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?)

- FOR “NO”: If not, what organizational or personal factor do you attribute to your getting your work done without having to work overtime?

---

Do you feel NSIR will be successful in retaining satisfied, long-term employees? (Y/N)

FOR PMDA ONLY: In the survey, some PMDA participants indicated that management doesn't hold people accountable for substandard work or non-performance. Is this your observation? (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": Provide a specific example of management not holding people accountable for substandard work or non-performance. (Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?)
- FOR "NO": How does management hold people accountable? Can you provide an example?

## **HELPFUL MECHANISMS**

In the survey, participants indicated that NSIR does not have effective procedures in place for managing workflow. Is this your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": Can you provide a specific example of a procedure or procedures needed for managing workflow for a specific product or products? (Is this issue getting better, worse, or remaining the same?)
- FOR "NO": Give an example of procedure that is effective for managing workflow for a specific product.

Are there business processes that aren't working well? Does anything come to mind?

Do you know of any pre-NSIR "best practices" (either from another NRC organization or your former organization or a stakeholder group, etc.) that NSIR should adopt or re-institute in order to improve its effectiveness or efficiency?

FOR DNS ONLY: In the survey, some DNS participants stated that NSIR/NRC does not provide the necessary information technology (systems/applications) to do an effective or efficient job. Is this your experience? (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": What specific technology do you lack that prevents you from doing an effective or efficient job?
- FOR "NO": What specific technology helps you to do an effective or efficient job?

## **ENVIRONMENT**

(N/A for IRO; N/A for PMDA, but ask anyway) In the survey, participants indicated that NSIR has not able to anticipate change and prepare for it. Is that your experience (Y/N)

- FOR "YES": What organizational factor do you feel is the cause for NSIR not being able to anticipate change and prepare for it?
- FOR "NO": Can you give an example of NSIR anticipating change and preparing for it?

Is there anything else you would like to add?



---

## **Appendix E. NSIR Stakeholder Interview Questions**

What is your job role/major responsibility?

How often do you interact with NSIR? (daily, hourly, weekly, monthly, quarterly, etc.)

How long have you been a stakeholder of NRC/NSIR?

Briefly describe the nature of your relationship/interactions with NSIR (e.g., stakeholder, customer, partner).

When was your last interaction with NSIR? Could you describe it?

As an (INTERNAL/EXTERNAL) stakeholder/partner, what are your expectations of NSIR (top 3)?

Does NSIR meet your expectations?

Is NSIR responsive to your requests?

Has the creation of NSIR improved security performance (compared to pre-9/11 or pre-NSIR)? How do you know? What data source tells you?

Are you seeing a trend (positive, negative, no change) in communication (specifically communication timeliness and consistency) compared to before NSIR was created?

Are you seeing a trend in business functions (e.g., security performance) - getting better, worse, or remaining the same - now that the NSIR organization is up and running?

(f applicable) Has the creation of NSIR improved NRC's capability and readiness to respond to events?

NSIR recently developed the following vision statement: "To be a valued partner in homeland security and Federal emergency response". In your opinion, where is NSIR in reaching that vision? Have they achieved their vision? If not, what do they specifically need to do?

In general, what does NSIR do well as an organization? What top 3 things come to mind?

In your experience with NSIR, are there areas that need to be improved? What top 3 things come to mind?

If you were to envision a picture of success for NSIR, what would that look like? Imagine an improved organization in a year from now.

Do you have any additional comments or questions for us?

### **Quantitative Questions**

The creation of NSIR has improved effectiveness of communications with (my office /

---

external stakeholders).

NSIR meets (my office's/its stakeholder's) expectations.

NSIR is responsive to (my office's /its stakeholder's) requests.

The creation of NSIR has improved timeliness of communications with (my office/external stakeholders).

The creation of NSIR has improved consistency of communications with (my office/external stakeholders).

---

## Appendix F. Survey Respondent Breakdown

**Administered:** Friday, November 15, 2002  
**Deadline:** Friday, November 22, 2002  
**Collected/cut off:** Monday morning, November 25, 2002  
**Return Response:** 72/120 (60%) respondents

### Overall Respondent Information

Division/section identified as:

- Office of the Director (2)
- PMDA (7)
- IRO (15)
- DNS (39)
- Division/section not identified (9)

Job function identified as:

- Division Deputy Director and above (6)
- Section Chief (5)
- Technical Staff (33)
- Administrative/Support (12)
- Job function not identified (16)

Total number of NSIR respondents: 72/120 (60%)

### Office of the Director Respondent Information

Division/section identified as:

- Office of the Director (2)

Job function identified as:

- Division Deputy Director and above (2)
- Section Chief (0)
- Technical Staff (0)
- Administrative/Support (0)

Total Office of Director respondents within Office of Director: 2/5 (40%)

Total Office of Director respondents within NSIR respondents: 2/72 (3%)

### PMDA Respondent Information

Division/section identified as:

- PMDA (7)
- SG Communications (0)
- Admin Support (0)
- Financial (0)

---

Job function identified as:

- Division Deputy Director and above (1)
- Section Chief (0)
- Technical Staff (1)
- Administrative/Support (4)
- Job function not identified (1)

Total PMDA respondents within PMDA: 7/11 (64%)

Total PMDA respondents within NSIR respondents: 7/72 (10%)

### **IRO Respondent Information**

Division/section identified as:

- IRO (4)
- Coordination (6)
- Operations (5)

Job function identified as:

- Division Deputy Director and above (1)
- Section Chief (0)
- Technical Staff (8)
- Administrative/Support (3)
- Job function not identified (3)

Total IRO respondents within IRO: 15/33 (45%)

Total IRO respondents within NSIR respondents: 15/72 (21%)

### **DNS Respondent Information**

Division/section identified as:

- DNS (13)
- Threat Assessment (3)
- Materials Safeguards (10)
- Reactor Safeguards Policy (6)
- Reactor Safeguards Oversight (5)
- Information Security (2)

Job function identified as:

- Division Deputy Director and above (2)
- Section Chief (4)
- Technical Staff (22)
- Administrative/Support (3)
- Job function not identified (8)

Total DNS respondents within DNS: 39/71 (55%)

Total DNS respondents within NSIR respondents: 39/72 (54%)

---

## **Appendix G. Interview Detail Data**

The NSIR interview detail data is not included in this report due to the confidentiality agreement with NSIR management and staff under which the data was collected. A redacted version consistent with the confidentiality agreement can be made available.